

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/960,599	09/21/2001	Steven M. Geiger	213828013US2	213828013US2 6626	
25096	7590 06/06/2006		EXAMINER		
PERKINS COIE LLP			FRIDIE JR,	FRIDIE JR, WILLMON	
PATENT-SE P.O. BOX 12			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			3722		
			DATE MAIL ED. 06/06/200	DATE MAIL ED. 06/06/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	····			<u> </u>				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		09/960,599	GEIGER ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Willmon Fridie	3722					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failt Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAPACES of 37 CFR 1.13 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, or reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a. cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communicati	·				
Status								
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 M	larch 2006.						
2a)□								
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	tion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 21 and 33-44 is/are pending in the ap	oplication.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)⊠	5) Claim(s) 21 is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>33-44</u> is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)□	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicat	ion Papers		·					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicati	ion No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		ed in this National Stage					
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	,						
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) La Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal P	Patent Application (PTO-152)					
- гаре	er No(s)/Mail Date	6)						

Art Unit: 3722

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 33-35,37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mantegazza.

Mantegazza discloses a voucher comprising: a substrate (2); a visible mark (3) placed on the substrate, wherein the visible mark has a first appearance on the substrate, but wherein a photocopy of the visible mark has a second appearance, different from the first appearance; and indicia printed on the substrate, wherein the indicia indicate a value for which the printed substrate can be redeemed in exchange for at least one of cash and merchandise.

Claims 40,42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sandru.

Sandru discloses all of the subject matter set forth in the claims. See column 1, lines 61-67 and column 2, lines 1-6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 36 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantegazza in view of Puckett.

. Puckett et al. teaches that it is well known in the art to use thermal paper for vouchers, receipts, etc.. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide form Mantegazza with thermal paper in the manner as taught by Puckett et al in order to increase the versatility of the printing process.

In regard to claim 36, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed indicia (bar code)since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. In re Gulack 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of indicia does not alter the

functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability.

Claims 41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandru.

With respect to claim 43, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed indicia (bar code)since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. In re Gulack 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of indicia does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability.

In regard to claim 41, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use the claimed dimension since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). It appears that there would be no new or unexpected result from such a modification.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 21is allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Willmon Fridie whose telephone number is 571 272 4476. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571 272 4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

wf

WILLMON FRIDIE, JR. PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5